APPENDIX E
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

This appendix describes the public comment process for the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) *Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement (CMRR) Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico*. Section E.1 describes the process for obtaining public comments on the *CMRR Draft EIS* and identifies the comment period and the location and date of public hearings. Section E.2 addresses the public hearing format, while Section E.3 discusses comment disposition. Sections E.4 and E.5 provide the comments presented at the public hearings and received via U.S. mail, e-mail, toll-free 800-number phone line, and toll-free fax, respectively, as well as NNSA's responses to those comments.

E.1 OVERVIEW

In May 2003, NNSA published the *CMRR Draft EIS*. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations mandate a minimum 45-day public comment period after publication of a draft EIS to provide an opportunity for the public and other stakeholders to comment on the EIS analysis and results. The public comment period on the *CMRR Draft EIS* began on May 16, 2003 and ended June 30, 2003 (46 days). During this comment period, public hearings were held in Los Alamos and Pojoaque, New Mexico. In addition, the public was encouraged to submit comments via the U.S. mail, e-mail, toll-free phone number, and fax.

The number of persons estimated in attendance at each hearing or meeting, together with the number of comments submitted and recorded, are presented in **Table E–1**. These attendance estimates are based on the number of registration forms completed and returned at each hearing or meeting, as well as a rough "head count" of the audience, and may not include all those present.

The public hearing comments were combined with comments received by other means (specifically, U.S. mail, e-mail, toll-free phone number, and fax) during the public comment period. Written comments were date-stamped and assigned a sequential document number. **Table E–2** lists the number of comments received by method of submission.

Table E–1 Public Hearing/Meeting Locations, Attendance, and Comments Received

Location	*Date*	*Estimated Attendance*	*Comments*
Los Alamos, New Mexico	June 3, 2003	14	9
Pojoaque, New Mexico	June 4, 2003	10	17

Table E–2 Method of Comment Submission

Method	*Number of Comments*
1-800 Number	0
E-mail	142
Fax	22
Hearings (written / oral)	0 / 29
U.S. Mail	29
Total	222

E.2 PUBLIC HEARING FORMAT

The public hearings were organized to encourage public comments on the *CMRR Draft EIS* and to allow two-way interaction between members of the public and representatives of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and NNSA. A court reporter was present at each hearing to record the proceedings and provide a transcript of the public comments and the dialogue between the public and the NNSA representatives on hand. These transcripts are available in DOE public reading rooms in New Mexico and Washington, DC.

The format used for each hearing included a presentation, question and answer session, and a public comment period. The hearing opened with a welcome from the facilitator, followed by a presentation of the proposed action by a representative of the NNSA. The facilitator next opened the question and answer session to give the audience a chance to ask questions about the presentation. This was followed by the public comment session, during which attendees were given an opportunity to comment and read from prepared statements. Following the public hearings, comments were identified from the transcripts of each hearing.

E.3 COMMENT DISPOSITION

All comments received during the *CMRR Draft EIS* comment period appear in Section E.4 and E.5 of this appendix. Section E.4 contains transcripts of the oral comments made at each of the two public hearings, along with NNSA's responses to each comment. Section E.5 presents scanned images of written comments received via U.S. mail, e-mail, and fax, along with NNSA's response to each comment.

Table E–3 is an index of all commentors who made statements at the public hearings or submitted comments during the public comment period, including members of the public, representatives of organizations or agencies, and public officials. Commentors are listed alphabetically by their last name, along with the page on which their comments appear in Sections E.4 or E.5. **Table E–4** identifies separately Federal, state, and local officials and agencies; companies; organizations; and special interest groups that submitted comments.

Table E–3 Index of Commentors

Commentor	***Commentor Number***	*Page Number*
John R. Acker	13 (campaign)	E-91
Matt Alexander	13 (campaign)	E-92
Denise Arthur	13 (campaign)	E-92
Linda Aspenwind	13 (campaign)	E-92
Leslie Behn	13 (campaign)	E-92
Shama Beach	13 (campaign)	E-92
Julie Bechko	13 (campaign)	E-92
Michael Bechko	13 (campaign)	E-92
Kathryn S. Becker	13 (campaign)	E-92
Deborah Beleff-Raynor	13 (campaign)	E-92
Shirley A. Belz	13 (campaign)	E-92
James T. Bemy	13 (campaign)	E-92
Stanley Beyrle	13 (campaign)	E-92
A.D. Bittson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Peter Botting	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jan Boyer	13 (campaign)	E-92
Keri Boynt	13 (campaign)	E-92
Bill Brimijoin	13 (campaign)	E-92
Andy Brokmeyer	14	E-93
Mary Bronsteter	13 (campaign)	E-92
Sarah Brooke Bishop	13 (campaign)	E-92
Mark W. Bundy	13 (campaign)	E-92
Janet Burstein	13 (campaign)	E-92
Aaron B. Czerny	13 (campaign)	E-92
Clark Case	13 (campaign)	E-92
Karen Cohen	13 (campaign)	E-92
Myles Courtney	13 (campaign)	E-92
Kathy & Phil Dahl-Bredine	13 (campaign)	E-92
Steve D. Dees	13 (campaign)	E-92
Michele Desgroseilliers	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jody C. Donaldson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Ann Eberlein	13 (campaign)	E-92
M. Jane Engel	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jay Ertel	13 (campaign)	E-92
Barbara Ford	13 (campaign)	E-92
Bernadette Fernandez	13 (campaign)	E-92
Sierra Fernandez	13 (campaign)	E-92
Raymond Finck	13 (campaign)	E-92
Dee Finney	13 (campaign)	E-92
Bobbie Fleming	13 (campaign)	E-92
Kimberly A. Foree	13 (campaign)	E-92
John & Diane Forsdale	13 (campaign)	E-92
Antoinette Fox	13 (campaign)	E-92
Colby Friend	13 (campaign)	E-92
Graciela Garcia	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jade Garcia	13 (campaign)	E-92
Myra Garcia	13 (campaign)	E-92

Commentor	***Commentor Number***	*Page Number*
Percyne Gardner	13 (campaign)	E-92
David R. Genth	13 (campaign)	E-92
Janice Gildea	13 (campaign)	E-92
Joe Gildea	13 (campaign)	E-92
Beth Ann Gillian	13 (campaign)	E-92
Kathleen Ann Gonzalez	13 (campaign)	E-92
Sally Goodknight	13 (campaign)	E-92
Matthew Goodro	13 (campaign)	E-92
Abraham J. Gordon	13 (campaign)	E-92
Patricia Griffin	13 (campaign)	E-92
Irena Grygorowicz	13 (campaign)	E-92
Linda H. Hardman	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jonathan Hare	13 (campaign)	E-92
Bob Harris	13 (campaign)	E-92
Barry Hatfield	13 (campaign)	E-92
Ann Hendrie	13 (campaign)	E-92
Linda Hibbs	15	E-94
Leah Hobgood	13 (campaign)	E-92
Nathan Houchin	13 (campaign)	E-92
Douglas Hughes, M.D.	13 (campaign)	E-92
Tiffany Hunter	13 (campaign)	E-92
Dorothy Jensen	13 (campaign)	E-92
Norma Jett	16	E-95
Marge Johnson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Richard Johnson	8	E-80
Alison Jones	13 (campaign)	E-92
Miles Jones	13 (campaign)	E-92
Kate Keely	13 (campaign)	E-92
Joy Kincaid	13 (campaign)	E-92
Kim A. Kirkpatrick	13 (campaign)	E-92
Sheri Kotowski	13 (campaign)	E-92
Tom Krozik	13 (campaign)	E-92
Alice K. Ladas	13 (campaign)	E-92
Leslie LaKind, D.D.S.	13 (campaign)	E-92
Brad Landers	13 (campaign)	E-92
Shaphan Laos	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jack Larson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Rick Lass	13 (campaign)	E-92
James Latorie	13 (campaign)	E-92
Lisa Law	13 (campaign)	E-92
Pilar Law	13 (campaign)	E-92
Patricia A. Leahan	13 (campaign)	E-92
R. Leland Lehrman	13 (campaign)	E-92
Andy Lilley	13 (campaign)	E-92
Susannah H. Lippman	13 (campaign)	E-92
Becky Lo Dolce	13 (campaign)	E-92
Ashana Lobody	13 (campaign)	E-92
Dale Lock	13 (campaign)	E-92

Commentor	***Commentor Number***	*Page Number*
Ross Lockridge and Ann Murray	17	E-96
Jane Lumsden	13 (campaign)	E-92
Sue Shen Lyons	13 (campaign)	E-92
Michael Mandell	13 (campaign)	E-92
Tor Matson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Dominique Mazeaud	13 (campaign)	E-92
Kristina McCarthy	13 (campaign)	E-92
M. Rachel McCarthy	13 (campaign)	E-92
Karen McClaren & Marcia Naveau	13 (campaign)	E-92
Anne McConnell	13 (campaign)	E-92
Beverly A. McCrary	13 (campaign)	E-92
Rita McElmury	13 (campaign)	E-92
Eric McEuen	13 (campaign)	E-92
Amy McFall	13 (campaign)	E-92
Caitlin McKee	13 (campaign)	E-92
Christine McLorrain	13 (campaign)	E-92
Lesley A. Michaels	13 (campaign)	E-92
Chris Mechels	201	E-15
Celeste Miller	13 (campaign)	E-92
Larry Miller	13 (campaign)	E-92
Ian Mioh	13 (campaign)	E-92
Ignacio Montano	13 (campaign)	E-92
Phyllis Montgomery	13 (campaign)	E-92
Carlos Mora	13 (campaign)	E-92
Ramona Morino	13 (campaign)	E-92
Amanda Murchison	13 (campaign)	E-92
Frank E. Murchison	13 (campaign)	E-92
Linda Naranjo-Huebl	13 (campaign)	E-92
Margaret Nes	13 (campaign)	E-92
David Nesbit	13 (campaign)	E-92
Renze Nesbit	13 (campaign)	E-92
Shel Neymark	13 (campaign)	E-92
Francesca Oldeni-Neff	13 (campaign)	E-92
Dennis Overman	13 (campaign)	E-92
Eileen Overman	13 (campaign)	E-92
Michael T. Pacheco	13 (campaign)	E-92
Claudia Parker	13 (campaign)	E-92
Robert E. Pearson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Antonio Perz	10	E-87
Giselle Piburn	13 (campaign)	E-92
Dave Pierce	13 (campaign)	E-92
Steve Piersol	13 (campaign)	E-92
Peter Prandoni	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jean Porteus	13 (campaign)	E-92
Robert Raynor	13 (campaign)	E-92
Adam Read	13 (campaign)	E-92
Matthew Reen	13 (campaign)	E-92
Alan Reis, II	13 (campaign)	E-92

Commentor	***Commentor Number***	*Page Number*
Robert Romeo	13 (campaign)	E-92
A. Ronew	13 (campaign)	E-92
Stanley Rosen	13 (campaign)	E-92
Eva Marie Salas	11	E-88
Jay Gilbert Sanchez	202	E-16
Cathy Sanchez	203	E-18
Lara A. Schwartz	13 (campaign)	E-92
Paula Seaton	13 (campaign)	E-92
Robert Seton	13 (campaign)	E-92
Michael Shorv	13 (campaign)	E-92
Raymond Singer, Ph.D.	13 (campaign)	E-92
Wendy Singer	13 (campaign)	E-92
Elliott Skinner	18	E-97
Shannyn Sollitt	13 (campaign)	E-92
J. Thea Spaeth	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jeff Spicer	13 (campaign)	E-92
Sonia Stromberg	13 (campaign)	E-92
Martin Suazo, Sr.	13 (campaign)	E-92
Cathie Sullivan	9	E-83
Cathy Swedlund	13 (campaign)	E-92
Michael Thebo	13 (campaign)	E-92
Stephanie Thebo	13 (campaign)	E-92
Laura Thompson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Elizabeth Blythe Timken	13 (campaign)	E-92
Aileen Torres-Hughes	13 (campaign)	E-92
Patrick L. Travers	13 (campaign)	E-92
Robin Urton	13 (campaign)	E-92
Jason P. Walsh	13 (campaign)	E-92
Ann P. Ware	12	E-89
Sally J. Warnick	13 (campaign)	E-92
Deanna M. Watson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Mark L. Watson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Kimberly Webber	13 (campaign)	E-92
Melonie Weishuhn	13 (campaign)	E-92
Michael Wiese	13 (campaign)	E-92
Michael Wiggs-West	13 (campaign)	E-92
Amy Williams	13 (campaign)	E-92
Dean Williamson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Natasha Williamson	13 (campaign)	E-92
Keith R. Wuertz	13 (campaign)	E-92
John F. Young	13 (campaign)	E-92
Nina Zelenunsky	13 (campaign)	E-92
Tiffin Zellers	13 (campaign)	E-92
Cecile J. Zeigler	13 (campaign)	E-92
Alice Zorthian	13 (campaign)	E-92

Table E–4 Index of Public Officials, Organizations, and Public Interest Groups

Commentor Information	***Commentor Number***	***Page Number***
Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, Joni Arends	13 101	E-90 E-9
Pueblo De San Ildefonso, Governor John Gonzales, New Mexico	1	E-25
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, Lois Chalmers, Arjun Makhijani, Ph.D	5	E-40
Nuclear Watch, Jay Coghlan	7 200	E-65 E-14
Sisters of Loretto, Pennelope McMullen	6 204	E-52 E-20
State of New Mexico Environment Department, Ron Curry, Secretary	4	E-33
State of New Mexico Environment Department, Bob Weeks	205	E-23
State of New Mexico Environment Department, Stephen Yanicak	100	E-8
United States Department of the Interior, Stephen R. Spencer	3	E-32
United States Environmental Protection Agency, Michael P. Jansky, P.E.	2	E-31

E.4 PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND NNSA RESPONSES

Comments presented in this section were submitted during oral presentations at the public hearings held on June 3, 2003, in Los Alamos, New Mexico, and June 4, 2003, in Pojoaque, New Mexico. NNSA's responses to these comments are also presented.

Comments from the Los Alamos, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 3, 2003		
***Comment** No.*	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
Stephen Yanicak – Commentor No. 100		
	I'm Steve Yanicak, I'm with the Environment Department of New Mexico Oversight Bureau. And I didn't really read the Volume 1, I'm basing this on the summary that I see here. And, since I work at the facility, we allow these sites, there is some general concerns that maybe are addressed in Volume 1. I don't know.	
100-1	So I'm seeing on page S-34, your waste streams that you have identified for the no action alternative which I assume is the CMRR upgrading as it is, then the preferred alternative where we have TA-55. I see all the waste streams like doubling and tripling, transuranic mixed waste low level, mixed low level, hazardous waste. I know where a lot of this stuff goes, the transuranic, mixed transuranic, all the low level, mixed low level, even the hazardous waste, I know a lot of that is either stored permanently at TA-44 or processed and moved off-site. I don't see in the summary now, it might be in volume 1, a summary of the liquid waste. It makes mention here that it is not discharged to the environment, but it's treated a TA-50. My concern is, since all this stuff is doubling and tripling, what is the liquid rad load to TA-50 going to be which is also another old facility that in my personal view should be upgraded and/or replaced. And again that's because I see all these waste streams going up and I know that the TA-50 operations are kind of struggling with what's going on now. So that's my comment.	As discussed in the *CMRR EIS*, Section 3.12.4, radioactive liquid waste (RLW) generated by CMR capabilities are transferred to the LANL Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility (RLWTF) at TA-50 for treatment; the treatment process removes radioactive solids, which are then disposed of as low-level radioactive waste at LANL's Area G within TA-54, and the resulting treated water is discharged to the environment through a permitted outfall within Mortandad Canyon. Discharges to Mortandad Canyon from TA-50 must meet stringent discharge parameters. The figures sited in the *CMRR EIS* for disposal of solid low-level waste include the solidified radioactive components removed from the previously RLW stream.
100-2	When I see a book like this for the CMRR building being moved, I know pretty much that this is probably going to happen. When I do see something like this for an antiquated facility, TA-50, even though I hear it might be in the works, I'm kind of wary that it's going to be overburdened. So I guess I would like to see maybe a list or maybe in a summary or something written where it lists the actual waste stream liquid that's currently going to TA-50 and if that's going to be up when they move to TA-55.	The TA-50 RLWTF has been upgraded several times over its operating history and NNSA is now contemplating a replacement facility that might be proposed and built sometime over the next 5 years. Changing and improving technology has allowed DOE to install several in-house small pretreatment or new treatment units of various types at the RLWTF and within buildings that house processes generating RLW. This has improved the way that LANL

Comments from the Los Alamos, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 3, 2003		
***Comment** No.*	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
100-2 (cont'd)	And how TA-50, the toilet of the operation is going to be able to manage all that. So from my standpoint that's what I'm concerned about.	manages this waste stream and has allowed the wastewaters discharged to the environment to meet regulatory requirements. Given the timing of contemplated replacement of the existing RLWTF before the year 2010 when the CMRR Facility, if constructed, would be completed, it is likely that a new RLWTF could receive future CMRR Facility RLW. A decision on the need for a contemplated replacement of the RLWTF would be independent of any decision made on the proposed CMRR Project. Changes have been made to the text in Section 4.3.11.1 of the *CMRR EIS* to clarify information presented regarding this liquid waste stream.
Joni Arends – Commentor No. 101		
101-1	My name is Joni Arends and I'm with Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. On page 4-73, when you talk about the cumulative effects, there is -- actually on 475, there's no actual numbers being listed for the water or the generation, the electrical generation. And so I was really looking for those numbers because I specifically asked for those in our comments during the scoping process to find out where the water was going to come from and the electricity to run the building, because obviously this building or these buildings will use a lot of water. In this it says that the increase of the water will be a million -- water gallons for the construction alone for the administrative offices and support it will be 13 or 1.35 million gallons. And then, when you talk about for the operations, it's 10.4 million gallons. I guess that's per year. But where that water is going to come from, that's an issue with the regard to the San Juan-Chama, and where the electricity is going to come from.	Sections 4.3.2, 4.4.2, 4.5.2, and 4.6.2 of the *CMRR EIS* reference projected demands on key site infrastructure resources including electricity and water. As stated in these sections, none of the action alternatives are projected to exceed DOE's leased groundwater rights to the Los Alamos water supply system or the electric import and production capabilities for LANL. Overall, no infrastructure capacity constraints are anticipated in the near term as LANL operational demands on site infrastructure, notably for electricity and water, have been well below those forecast in the 1999 SWEIS. Increases in electrical and water demand by the new CMMR Facility would be largely offset by decreases in operational use at the existing CMR Building as its operations are reduced or completely eliminated over time. Nevertheless, LANL is actively pursing potable water use and electricity consumption reductions through conservation methods. For example, the new Nicholas C. Metropolis Center for Modeling and Simulation reuses water in its chilling towers, low-flush toilets, and low-energy use lighting fixtures were installed in the building, along with the use of native vegetation for landscaping, all of which are examples of conservation-minded measures implemented for all new LANL construction projects. Additionally, on-site electric power generator(s) will be installed in the next year to meet peak-loading requirements into the future. Additional electric power can be purchases from the national

Comments from the Los Alamos, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 3, 2003		
***Comment** No.*	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
101-1 (cont'd)		electric power grid when available and up to the maximum carrying capacity of the LANL supply grid system. NNSA would like to clarify the commentor's statement regarding water use: projections for the construction phase of the administrative offices and support function building is 1.35 million gallons per year and 10.4 million gallons per year for the CMRR Facility during operations.
101-2	And then also we support what Steve Yanicak said with regard to TA-50. And it seems like TA-50, it's been talked about every decade since the seventies, the eighties, and nineties, that it would be upgraded or that it would be replaced. And Steve Fong said that it's going to be replaced in -- it's on the schedule for '05, '06, or '07. And it seems like again the cart is before the horse because, you know, the discharges are going into the Mortandad Canyon. Another problem that CCNS has is you state on one of these pages that there's not going to be any discharge from TA-50. Let's see, the liquid waste.	NNSA notes the commentor's support of the need for a new TA-50 Radiological Liquid Waste Treatment Facility at LANL. No untreated radioactive liquid effluent would be produced from the proposed CMRR Facility. Text clarification has been added to Section 4.3.11.1 of the *CMRR Final EIS* regarding this waste stream.
101-3	And you have a footnote B on that page, where it says that there is -- oh, here it is. Page S-25, radiological -- nonradiological liquid effluent in gallons. You say that's going to be a half a million gallons a year. But that, you know, there's not going to be any radiological release when, in fact, there are. There are radionuclides. They're below the standards, but there are radionuclides that go down into Mortandad Canyon. And I think, because of the concerns about the transport systems or the lack of knowledge about the transport systems through Mortandad Canyon with regard to these contaminants and that some of the contaminants may be showing up in the springs, during this time period of this construction project, the TA-50 issue should really be looked at. I kind of skipped over some space. But basically that there are discharges into Mortandad Canyon and flushing that happens every single day from operations at TA-50. And the CMRR building and TA-55 need to be addressed in this document, you know, because it's causing the flushing of the contaminants through the system to the river.	The commentor refers to information contained in Footnote "b" to Table S-2 of the Summary document, which states "No direct discharge to the environment. Radiological liquid waste would be collected and transported to TA-50 for treatment". This statement is elaborated upon in the text of the *CMRR EIS*. The RLWTF discharges treated water (effluent) into the environment through an outfall that is permitted by the State of New Mexico; the outfall effluent is periodically monitored against permit limitations for several water quality standards.
101-4	And then CCNS has some real concerns about the design and build approach with regard to this building in terms of its an unacceptable way to proceed, I mean you guys, the LANL in general, you see DOE has so many problems.	There has been no formal decision on the acquisition strategy for the CMRR Facility Project as the NEPA process is not final yet and a decision to proceed with an action alternative for the project has not been made. NNSA is investigating the potential use of design-build procurements

Comments from the Los Alamos, New Mexico, Public Hearing *June 3, 2003*		
***Comment** No.*	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
101-4 (cont'd)		where appropriate as the conceptual design for the CMRR Facility is developed. At the current stage of project development, NNSA is of the opinion that application of design-build procurement for certain elements of the project, most notably the Administrative Offices and Support Activities Building, may be warranted. This opinion is based on size, complexity, and recent operational experience with design-build procurement applications on similar projects at LANL. Final decisions regarding CMRR procurement strategies would be made through the Critical Decision 1 process (currently projected for about March 2004) if the NNSA decides to proceed with one of the project action alternatives.
101-5	If I'm the only person speaking, do you mind if I speak longer than the five minutes? It's really an insult, excuse me. I have spent a lot of time preparing for this. And, you know, the five-minute limit I understand, but there's nobody signed up. CCNS has some major problems with regard to the design and build approach of this facility in terms of there's an envelope of space between $450 million and $900 million. And it seems like, with the cost overruns that have happened historically at Los Alamos, that this just opens the door for this to become a $1.8 billion project in reality. And so there has to be some kind of constraint on this project. We have really a lot of problems with this design and build.	While cost is one of the factors to be considered by decision makers in any Record of Decision, cost analysis is beyond the scope of the *CMRR EIS*, which focuses on evaluating potential environmental impacts of the proposed action alternatives. CMRR Project cost estimates are currently described in terms of a range ($420M to $955M) consistent with DOE Order 413.3 requirements for this phase of a project. The final detailed cost estimate for the project would be established at Critical Decision 2 (Approval of Performance Baseline) currently projected to occur in 2005 if the decision is to proceed with the CMRR Project. Congress determines funding allocations among DOE and NNSA projects; NNSA then spends monies consistent with this congressional direction.
101-6	And we have a lot of problems with the fact that the estimates for the CMRR demolition are not really taken into account because, at the time of the building was built, if it's the largest building in New Mexico, 550 thousand square feet. And where is all that waste going. I mean you say that it's going to be able to fit in TA-54. And we know that TA-54 is basically full because there's other alternatives to build other landfills in other places. I mean that's part of the environmental impact statement as well.	NNSA notes the commentor's concern that Area G in TA-54 will not accommodate waste from demolition of the Existing CMR Building. As discussed in Section 3.12.4 of the *CMRR EIS*, LANL will expand disposal capacity sites for low-level waste in Area G to provide onsite disposal for an additional 50 to 120 years. Solid low-level waste can alternately be packaged for disposal at off-site licensed commercial facilities.

Comments from the Los Alamos, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 3, 2003		
***Comment** No.*	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
101-6 (cont'd)	And then, with regard to page 4-76, there are statements in here about the waste management, specifically with regard that there are statements that sufficient capacity exists to manage waste in these operations. And in some respects that's a disingenuous statement because we know that there are proposals for other waste dumps that are in the site wide environmental impact statement. We have concerns about the next paragraph where it says there could be in terms of the expanded operations alternative and the LANL SWEIS, the environmental impact statement could result in the generation of a large amount of TRU waste. And so then there's a statement about the available capacity and then there's mention of new capacity of a replacement facility. And that's something I have never heard about before, a replacement facility for WIPP. But it says that the large volumes of waste will be accommodated or the estimated cumulative volumes of TRU waste from the CMRR replacement modern pit facility and other DOE facility operations. So, when there's 40,000 drums of transuranic waste at the current time at TA-54 and there's only a process right now to deal with 2,000 of those drums and you're going to leave 38,000 drums on the mesa and then you're saying these facilities, these new buildings, the modern pit facility but then the CMRR replacement, that you're going to have many buildings, the possibility of five buildings total, four buildings? Three? But some of your drawings have more than that, don't they, in terms of the administrative buildings? So anyways 38,000 drums are going to be sitting on the mesa top in the meantime while you're going to be generating more waste, you're going to be generating waste from the demolition of the CMRR building which there will inevitably be some TRU waste in that waste stream as well.	DOE considered proposals for LANL's future low level radioactive waste disposal needs in the *LANL SWEIS* analyses. The *LANL SWEIS* analyzed impacts associated with the expansion of Area G into adjacent areas within TA-54. Regarding to the disposition of TRU wastes anticipated to be generated within the next 10 years and the existing inventory of TRU waste drums awaiting disposal at WIPP, many if not all of these drums of waste will be deposited at WIPP before the proposed CMRR Facility, if approved, would be expected to become operable in 2010. The placement of the Modern Pit Facility at LANL is under consideration at this time. NNSA will require TRU waste disposition into the future for all its facilities. The NNSA is already contemplating the disposal of TRU waste when WIPP has been filled to capacity. As the planning and construction of such a facility would take a number of years, it is appropriate for NNSA to begin contemplating this eventuality now. No project plans have been developed yet regarding a WIPP replacement project.
101-7	So there's just a lot of concerns that I don't think are directly addressed in these documents, in the summary or in this, with regard to waste generation, with regard to water usage, where the water is coming from, where the electricity is going to come from, if it's going to impact, you know, are you going to try to run the Ojo line again or bring that proposal forward to get more electricity up here. So we're very concerned about the lack of thoroughness with the CMRR replacement EIS at this point. Thank you.	NNSA refers the commentor to the previous 8 comment responses. NNSA is not aware of any plan to install the previously proposed Ojo Line into LANL across the Jemez Mountains. The Ojo Line was proposed in the 1980s and a multi-agency EIS was prepared for the project as the transmission line would have involved crossing lands managed by several Federal agencies. The Ojo Line would have been installed and operated by the Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM), which is a New Mexico

Comments from the Los Alamos, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 3, 2003		
***Comment** No.*	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
101-7 (cont'd)		based electric service corporation; the new electric power transmission line would have serviced northern New Mexico customers. However, the project was ultimately aborted before implementation.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
Jay Coghlan – Commentor No. 200		
200-1	And I'm actually especially saddened by this chemical and metallurgical replacement project, seeing that, you know, pretty much the essence of the same proposal was defeated in the early nineties, when Congress declined to appropriate funds for it given the end of the Cold War. And I think the same principle still holds true. This facility is not really needed.	The purpose and need for the proposed CMRR Facility is stated in Chapter 1 of the *CMRR EIS*. NNSA notes the commentor's opinion about the need for the CMRR Project.
200-2	I think the draft EIS is deficient in a number of ways. And here I get to sneak in a number of my questions. You've got nothing about costs. It was reported last August the costs were up to $950 million. In the '04 budget, NNSA states that it's going to be $600 million. And the approximate $400 million in savings is a result of taking a design-build approach. Well, that's certainly an interesting approach for Los Alamos. Using the dual access radiographic hydrodynamic testing facility as an example, we start out with a facility that initially is going to cost 80 million and now it's around 300 million. Needless to say there's much in the news and Congressional hearings, et cetera, et cetera, about Los Alamos fiscal mismanagement. The premise that 400 million can be saved by taking a simultaneous design-build approach is absurd to me. I think the final EIS should address both costs and just identify these cost savings as well.	While cost is one of the factors to be considered by decision makers in any Record of Decision, cost analysis is beyond the scope of the *CMRR EIS*, which focuses on evaluating potential environmental impacts of the proposed action alternatives. CMRR Project cost estimates are currently described in terms of a range ($420M to $955M) consistent with DOE Order 413.3 requirements for this phase of a project. The final detailed cost estimate for the project would be established at Critical Decision 2 (Approval of Performance Baseline) currently projected to occur in 2005 if the decision is to proceed with the CMRR Project. Congress determines funding allocations among DOE and NNSA projects; NNSA then spends monies consistent with this congressional direction.
200-3	Okay. Another primary mission for this replacement facility that's stated in the draft EIS and that I have a particular interest in is that the facility would use at the cleanout facility containment vessels. I don't doubt that these containment vessels would be cleaned out there. I don't think that's the true purpose. First, for the sake of those that may not know, this would involve hydrotests, where they blow up plutonium and highly enriched uranium and noncritical test. But I suggest that the final EIS especially given that this facility's primary mission is for analytical chemistry and material characterization should discuss the role of what I believe would be analysis of test shot debris. That's what I suspect is the real submission to the facility, that you'll do these hydrotests. You blow them up in these containment vessels, you bring them to the project, analyze, you know, analytical chemistry, et cetera, et cetera, all of which leads to enhanced tests, diagnosis. And furthermore in the EIS the exact relationship to future advanced hydrotest facilities should be discussed. And I'll cut it off.	The cleanout of containment vessels from testing procedures is being proposed for the new CMRR Facility as a matter of practicality, work efficiency and worker safety. Analyses of debris removed from the these types of vessels has been conducted in the CMR Building for many years; continuing the analytical procedures in the new CMRR Facility is included by the analyses of the operation of the new facility in the *CMRR EIS*. No additional text has been added to the *CMRR Final EIS*.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing *June 4, 2003*		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
Chris Mechels – Commentor No. 201		
201-1	A brief history of the CMR building for those of you who may not know about it, some of you may agree, the history of the CMR building is replete with such things as exploding ovens. Remember when we blew them all to pieces. Fortunately nobody was killed. That was one stand-down. Then there was the mishandled nuclear target, when they sort of forgot that radiation had more than one direction coming off a target. Well, that was sort of fortunate that nobody was killed. Then we had the situation where somebody got contaminated but not killed. It takes some time to die so it doesn't matter. Then we had the fire alarm system where it turned out that they had neglected to have an up-to-date fire alarm system in spite of the fact that people had been cautioned about this for five years. That resulted in everybody having fire watches at CMR then for some years. Well, they finally put a new fire alarm system in which they hadn't gotten around to before then. I draw your attention to what's going on here. There's nothing wrong with the building. I repeat, there was nothing wrong with the building that caused any of these outrageous accidents. What was wrong was the management of Los Alamos National Laboratory. Fixing that building will not fix the management of Los Alamos National Laboratory. And I suggest that is a problem. Indications of the problem are these Los Alamos National Laboratory site profiles which are quite interesting reading. And they mention a lot of problems with CMR including their stand-down in '87, their stand-downs in '98, I think they had a stand-down in '96. They were doing an awful lot of work which cost us a lot of money. Nothing has to do with the building, it all has to do with Los Alamos management. By the way, these same profiles are no longer available, they pulled them off the web. The occurrence reports which reflected some of the accidents going on at the CMR building and TA-55 reflected Los Alamos' horrible management record including the famous mess-up at TA-55 in 2000. This is not the way to do business, folks.	The NNSA would like to clarify the commentor's statements about accessibility of information about LANL, in particular about incidents at LANL facilities. After the events of September 11, 2001, the NNSA, along with other Federal agencies, either restricted access to certain information already posted electronically on Internet web sites, or removed the information entirely from the Internet for security reasons. The NNSA has gradually been reviewing electronic information and re-establishing Internet accessibility to information either on a restricted basis or not, depending upon the sensitivity of the information. Publicly available information, such as NEPA documents, remains available in hard copy form. Information about LANL incidents, actions and related lessons learned is available in hard copy form via a quarterly publication by LANL called the *Los Alamos Mirror*; this document may be obtained by calling (505) 667-0604 and requesting a copy. The NNSA notes the commentor's suggestions about the management of LANL and about the assignment of the Modern Pit Facility and the CMRR Facility to the DOE's Savannah River facility. As stated in Section 2.6.1, relocating CMR capabilities from LANL was considered and dismissed from further analysis in the *CMRR EIS*.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
201-1 (cont'd)	All of this stuff became unavailable in February of this year. I've been talking to DOE trying to say why did it take the occurrence reports off the web site, why are you hiding all this. I don't get an answer. Is it because it's inconvenient? Look, the problem here is not anything but the Los Alamos management. Giving it a new building will not fix that. But I would suggest, as a taxpayer and somebody who concerned himself with worker safety and has for a long time, that you take this modern pit facility and the attendant needs that you have for metallurgical research and give it to Savannah River. Unlike Los Alamos they actually have a record of knowing how to manage things without totally messing it up. Just look at the occurrence reports. I can't get them anymore. But the occurrence reports would show you that the record at Savannah River which is run by Allied Chemical I believe. They actually have some idea of what to do about running facilities without messing up their employees and the citizens and endangering them. So I suggest, why don't you take the modern pit facility and why don't you hold off on the CMR building because it's not hurting the operations at Los Alamos, their management is hurting the operations at Los Alamos. The CMR building I think could last six more years. Take the modern pit facility and CMR and don't put them at Los Alamos because they're clueless, and all indications are they will remain clueless because they've been clueless for six years, and give it to Savannah River.	
201-2	I don't like this project, but for God's sake put it someplace where they have a track record of knowing how to do this stuff. This place does not. Spare us, please. Thank you.	The NNSA notes the commentor's dislike for the CMRR Project.
Jay Gilbert Sanchez – Commentor No. 202		
202-1	I have great concerns of what is going on up there not only with this building. The first question I have or concern I have is you have not satisfied me as a private person or as a former tribal official as to what you have done about the safety hazards and the safety violations that you have not adhered to over the last 60 years and how you are going to adhere to those guidelines impacting my people, my future. If you don't know, if my tribal leadership has not made you aware, we're feeling the impacts finally after 60 years of being your neighbors, your gracious neighbors. And you sit on my most holiest of holy ground, the holiest of holy land.	The NNSA notes the commentor 's concerns about safety hazards and violations, as well as the commentor's concerns that LANL's operations have caused harm to neighboring people and that the facility is located on ground considered holy by the Pueblo of San Ildefonso.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
202-2	In another era, maybe in the future, my people, my young men, my young women, might stand up against you and do what the Palestinians are doing against the Israelis with all the odds and scientific knowledge and weapons they have against them, just believing in their faith to stand up against you as we did in 1680. But this time we will not fail because our commitment to our life-giver will be much greater. You sit on my holiest of holy land, building the weapons of mass destruction for this person called Bush, pretending under the name of peace to be doing these things. I ask you, each and every one of you, in your heart look to see how much damage we have done to ourselves, how much damage we are doing to others. We are the casualties, the community casualties of war. You have not dropped the atomic bomb on my people. But the waste and the legacy that has come off that hill is devastating. It is showing in my Pueblo brothers and sisters to the south of us along the Rio Grande. It's showing up in Brownsville.	The NNSA notes the commentor's opinion regarding radioactive wastes causing damages to members of Pueblos along the Rio Grande all the way to the Gulf of Mexico. The NNSA refers the commentor to response 6-23 regarding radionuclides being present in the Rio Grande. The quality of the surface water reaching the Rio Grande from canyons located across LANL is better than the quality of the waters of the river at that point in its journey to the Gulf of Mexico due to naturally occurring contaminants, primarily heavy metals, carried by the waters. (See LANL Annual Surveillance Reports for additional water quality information.)
202-3	At this point in time, I would like to implement an old tradition. When an elder speaks, there's no time limitations within our customs. This is nothing but bureaucracy, American bureaucracy that we're talking about here. Life is not 5 minutes of breath, life is not 5 minutes of being cleansed. You cleanse my area, you cleanse my holy land, and I will think about allowing you to stand up there and do the things you want to do. And I'm talking about all the things you want to do. Sixty years of dirt, of trash, of waste of plutonium in my water. Nitrates in my water that cannot be found that are not biological. Those things are what I'm talking about. I appreciate your understanding, I appreciate what you're doing for world peace. But for humanity's sake, let's quit killing ourselves. As I said I am the casualty, community casualty of the war machine of this country and you work for him. You may call yourself the Department of Energy. But you work for him. You work for the development of weapons of mass destruction. If this is what your concern is, why don't we all go en masse back to the Atlantic, start walking there en masse, and simply kill ourselves and cleanse this world of what we have done. The vegetables you eat are contaminated from waste from Los Alamos National Laboratory. Don't forget in February, late March, late December or late winter, early spring, we get all the vegetables coming in from South Valley, Texas. We get the water from the Rio Grande. I know I am privileged to be here. I thank you.	The NNSA notes the commentor's statements about the need to clean up the legacy waste at LANL and his opinion about water contamination from LANL operations. NNSA would like to clarify that no plutonium has been identified in LANL-area drinking water or in the southern reaches of the Rio Grande. Vegetables and fruits grown in the close vicinity of LANL are not known to be contaminated with radionuclides at levels above those grown elsewhere in nearby areas of northern New Mexico; crops grown in southern Texas and watered from the Rio Grande are not known to be contaminated with radionuclides at levels above those grown elsewhere in southern Texas. Also see the response to Comment 6-23.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
Cathy Sanchez – Commentor No. 203		
203-1	Okay. My name is Cathy Sanchez, I am from the San Idelfonso Pueblo. I am speaking in terms of my native women perspective and also as mother and grandmother and a person very conscious about the wellness of children and families and the business that is happening up there at Los Alamos. I don't have anything scientifically to ask as far as questioning or as far as wanting to debate over issues that are wrong and happening. But my gut level reaction, because we do see the death, the illnesses, and the contamination of our Mother Earth that's happening. I today did a whole workshop on pottery making and a spiritual cultural context of the clay. And I felt very good about that interaction with Mother Earth and to generate and give life. And yet here tonight I stand before you knowing that the business that's happening in our most sacred area is contaminating our water, our land, our clays, our foods, our animals, and our children and our genetic pools. And I have traveled enough to know in other parts of the world, especially in Russia and South Africa and Japan and China, I see nuclear reactors, nuclear mishaps. I have talked to people in Russia, the women, and what business the scientists are in. And we see our scientists from Los Alamos and watch the Tar Village people being used as guinea pigs. And I wonder how much the people around here are being used as guinea pigs, because we have not had the proper safeguards, the trainings, the cleansing, the taking care of the waste and the reactive waste that's coming off the hill and how it's affecting us. I have grandchildren. And I pray that they are physically, mentally, and spiritually connected and well because I also have seen babies and have also seen the deformities that have started happening down south of us in Mexico and the fish that we're pulling out of the river and the cesspool that sits up south of us known as Cochiti Lake. I went to a graduation reception there. And just seeing the gray wall that's there and knowing that behind that wall lies a settling pond, a pool that's been dredged of the nuclear sediments. I have asked earlier times for the solid waste pond or pool, for the cleansing of that.	NNSA notes the commentor's concerns regarding health issues associated with LANL operations and waste disposal practices. Chapter 4 of this EIS describes impacts on health and waste management.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
203-1 (cont'd)	What is being done for that so far? I haven't gotten any comments back from that to see where that's going with the discharge into the Rio Grande. And I think the last I heard was that they were using evaporation to lessen the amount of volume, to take care of what's happened up there. I don't know what else to say, but I'm here because I know I should be here, knowing that my comments may not impact on the brain and the mind area. But if it just touches further down into the heart area. People are realizing we didn't departmentalize different buildings and different programs, knowing that they all come together to make the mechanisms that are going to create the weapons of mass destruction that are going to be used against our own brothers and sisters throughout the world. And, if there were any peaceful use to the nuclear industry, I would say go for it. But, knowing in my gut reaction there is no peaceful use because we are contaminating ourselves, we are having the waste, we're not taking care of the waste that's coming out of the river, we're not thinking of how safe and how feasible the plans are for the CMR buildings. We talked earlier about the neutron facilities that were being built earlier. I hope that did not happen. I hope that this thing does not happen in Los Alamos as far as getting it prepped and ready for bigger detonations. And we are hearing the blasts that are happening and we are keeping track and we are seeing planes fly over to check for hot spots and release. So we are conscious that things are happening up there that shouldn't be happening. And, in our spiritual way, we really need to get back to our wellness. And that's not going to happen as long as we are disrupting the energy cycles that are not meant to be that. Native indigenous peoples throughout the world are praying for the wellness of everybody including the Americans. We want our younger brothers and sisters to come back to the heart and learn how to be united as a family to stop this business that is very harmful and destructive and polluting and toxic and not well intended for our peoples. Money does not generate -- money generation is tainted money from this. And I hope you realize where that is coming from. Thank you.	

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
Pennelope McMullen – Commentor No. 204		
204-1	Okay. The Federal Register lists potential issues for analysis. The first two issues listed are potential human health impacts both to members of the public and to workers and potential impacts to air, water, and soil. I consider these two issues to be interrelated because a contaminated environment affects human health.	The NNSA acknowledges the commentor's statement about the interrelationship of contaminant in the environment and human health concerns.
204-2	The draft environmental impact statement summary states that, quote, for the most part, environmental impacts would be small, unquote. I find that statement to be amazing. It has been documented at every nuclear site that, for every stage of production, the making of nuclear weapons, even if never used, is hazardous to workers, to our environment, to people yet unborn. Nuclear production from the mining and the milling of uranium ore to transportation, actual production, testing, and the disposal of radioactive waste is harmful to the workers, the environment, and the public. What the DOE considers small is not considered small by the public.	The summary statement characterizing potential environmental impacts of a new CMRR Facility as "small" is correct. The *CMRR EIS* considers direct, indirect and cumulative impacts related to the proposed action alternatives and for the No Action Alternative. The CMRR Facility would not be a mining, milling, production, testing or disposal site for nuclear weapons as suggested by the commentor. LANL is operated under an Integrated Safety Management System designed to achieve operational effectiveness through the integration of environmental compliance, quality assurance, risk assessment and mitigation, and safety and health protection procedures, incorporated by design into work planning and implementation of those plans. The CMRR Facility would be operated in accordance with the LANL management system.
204-3	My summary in terms of transportation and waste only talks about the onetime transport of special nuclear material. But special nuclear material will have to be shipped into the Los Alamos area and the subsequent waste will need to be disposed of. This part of the DEIS is woefully inadequate. I'm not going to say more about that right now.	The DEIS and its Summary identify the one-time transportation needed for the initial loading of special nuclear material (SNM) into a new CMRR Facility from the existing CMR Building, along with routine shipments of samples between the Plutonium Facility and a new CMRR Facility. Adequate inventories of SNM are already present at LANL for ongoing AC and MC operations; no additional SNM would need to be shipped to LANL as a result of a NNSA decision to proceed with the construction and operation of the CMRR Facility at LANL. The shipment of SNM between other DOE sites and LANL that occurs periodically for a variety of purposes was analyzed in the *LANL SWEIS*. Therefore, no additional analysis of offsite transport of SNM is provided in the *CMRR EIS*. The transportation impact assessment as explained in Sections 2.9.3 and 4.7.1 of the *CMRR EIS*, analyzes the one-time movement of SNM, equipment, and other materials during transition from the existing CMR Building to the new CMRR Facility, and the routine onsite transport of AC and MC samples between the Plutonium Facility and the new CMRR Facility.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
204-3 (cont'd)		SNM would be transported from the existing CMR Building and from the Plutonium Facility at LANL. The one-time transport of these materials would be performed on restricted and controlled roads that would be closed to the public. Once a shipment is prepared for low speed and controlled movement onsite, the likelihood and consequence of any foreseeable accident are considered to be small. The various wastes generated in the new CMRR Facility are those evaluated in the 1999 *LANL SWEIS* under the Expanded Operations Alternative. The impacts of the disposition of these wastes are also evaluated in the *LANL SWEIS*. Therefore, the impacts from disposition of the generated wastes have already been evaluated and accounted for in the *CMRR EIS*, as part of the site-wide cumulative impacts. (Section 4.7.1 of the Final *CMRR EIS* has been revised to reference 1999 *LANL SWEIS* for the transportation impacts from disposition of generated wastes.)
204-4	Regarding environmental justice, the DEIS summary table S-3 concludes, quote, no disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low income populations. The glossary did not include the definition of minority. In its environmental assessment for the biosafety lab 3, LANL lists the Hispanic population as white. So that the surrounding population does not appear to be a minority. A national survey of sites for the production, testing of nuclear weapons, and disposal of radioactive waste shows most of them located in low income minority communities, an example of severe environmental racism.	Definitions of the terms "minority population" and "low-income populations" have been added to the glossary of the Summary document; the terms were defined in glossary of the *CMRR Draft EIS* and discussed in detail in Appendix D of this EIS. As described in Section D.2, all persons self-identified as Hispanic or Latino (of any race) are counted among the minority population in the *CMRR EIS* analyses. As described in Section D.4, among all counties in New Mexico, Los Alamos County has the smallest percentage of persons living below the poverty threshold and the smallest percentage of minority residents; the residents of Los Alamos County live in closer proximity to LANL than do the residents of any other New Mexico county.
204-5	Regarding socioeconomics the DEIS summary table S-3 considered only whether or not there was an increase in work force. This is not the only criteria for considering socioeconomic impacts. We need to look at the total picture. Most New Mexico citizens remain in the low income range. We have one of the highest percentages of children living in poverty. Los Alamos is not helping the economy of New Mexico. On the contrary, there have been a number of studies which show that, when the defense industry has moved out of an area, civilian industry moved in and the general economy of the area improved.	The NNSA opines that the economy of New Mexico is helped by LANL. Should LANL cease to employee over 12,000 people in direct jobs, many of which are highly specialized and require advanced education, civilian industry would not readily move into the area given its location, lack of transportation (specifically air cargo jet, aircraft service, train service, or interstate highway service),and lack of readily available raw materials. A more likely scenario resulting from LANL closure would be that local communities near LANL would suffer and that the overall economy of New Mexico would diminish.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
204-5 (cont'd)	In one study conducted by the U.S. Government of 100 bases that have been closed around the country, in 98 of these areas, alternative industry had been developed and had brought an increase in the economy of the local community. You may read Economics and Military. Some economics explain that every million dollars spent means a loss of more than 2,000 civilian jobs. Our nation spends more tax dollars on the military defense than on housing, education, social welfare, food, employment, transportation, energy, and environmental programs combined. As a result one in four U.S. children now lives in poverty. And New Mexico's children rank high on the poverty scale. The monies spent on nuclear weapons production has, in effect, been stolen from the poor. National security also requires an economic vitality with healthy and well-educated citizens. New Mexico citizens do not feel secure when we cannot find employment, cannot afford health insurance, or cannot pay the rent. And one argues who will run our nation tomorrow that cannot figure basic math problems. We would feel much more secure if those millions of dollars would be spent on the necessity of life, affordable housing, renewable energy, high quality education, meaningful employment, accessible healthcare, and adequate nutritional food for everyone.	
204-6	In conclusion, in addition to nuclear weapons being illegal which we'll talk about in the question and answer thing, they are also immoral and are condemned by all the major religions because they murder many citizens. 2,000 Catholic bishops gathered publicly and explained that the use of nuclear weapons is a crime against God and humanity itself. Each time that I speak about the evil of nuclear weapons, someone in the nuclear industry tells me that she or he is not an evil person. I grant that the people involved are mostly good people. But so are the Germans who cooperated with the Nazis. It's easy for good people to get caught in an evil system. And, once information is given to you, it points out the rawness of continuing an evil system, it is on your conscience. There is one place in the Bible where Genesis tells us what we will be asked when our personal judgment day comes. I challenge each of you involved in any part of the CMRR plan to imagine your last	The NNSA notes the commentor's conclusions about the issue of the immorality of nuclear weapons.

Comments from the Pojoaque, New Mexico, Public Hearing June 4, 2003		
Comment No.	***Comment***	***NNSA Response***
204-6 (cont'd)	day on this earth and to prepare to meet your Creator. You will be asked if you fed the hungry, if you helped the poor and the disadvantaged, or did you participate in the use of tax monies for expensive building of weapons, preventing the poor and disadvantaged from receiving the help they needed. Think about it, DOE. Thank you.	
Bob Weeks – Commentor No. 205		
205-1	My name is Bob Weeks, I'm with the New Mexico Environment Department. My question pertains to the numbers on page S-34 of the draft statement. Particularly I'm looking at the no-action alternatives and the number of pounds of hazardous waste per year and then the alternative options and the number of pounds of hazardous waste per year and wondering why is there an increase of about 2.5 times for the alternatives if emission is essentially the same.	The apparent jump in waste quantities listed in Table S-3 of the Summary document between the No Action Alternative and the action alternatives is a reflection of the status quo of the CMR Buildings restricted operations and the Expanded Operations Alternative that DOE would pursue for LANL operations over the foreseeable future, including the operations conducted with the CMRR Facility, if the decision is made to pursue this facility project. Emissions from use of hazardous materials would increase for the action alternatives over that identified for the No Action Alternative but would be expected to remain within regulatory standards. More complete discussion of emissions is provided within Sections 4.3.3, 4.4.3, 4.5.3 and 4.6.3 of the *CMRR EIS*. The summary table provided in the referenced page is, by design, very brief in the discussion it provides.
205-2	And then secondly, if we look at the maximally exposed individual on an annual basis, the dose under alternative number two is about 200 times what it is for no action. And so these are technical questions. And I wonder if somebody could give me a technical answer. Thank you.	The restricted level of operations for the No Action Alternative and the increased level of operations for the action alternatives result in the projected differences regarding the maximally exposed individual.